

OCT 21 1999

EIS000312

5 MS. KILPATRICK: Good evening. My name's
6 Rita Kilpatrick, and I am the director of Campaign
7 for a Prosperous Georgia. We are a rate payer-
8 based organization and work on energy policy
9 statewide in Georgia. And I wish, when I was the
10 age of the young woman who just spoke before me --
11 I wish, when I was that age, I could have stood up
12 and said the things that she did. That takes a lot
13 of experience living near a plant and a facility
14 that has relied on nuclear power and nuclear
15 weapons for its livelihood, and I respect that
16 opinion very much.

17 Concerning the proposal at hand here in the
18 EIS, we are looking at this from the standpoint of
19 electricity rate payers and also from the
20 standpoint of public health, particularly for
21 those citizens in Georgia who live along the
1... 22 projected transportation route. And [from a rate
23 payer perspective, we've been paying quite some
24 time, as has been indicated and well known, to
25 this fund for a solution to the nuclear waste

|

1 1 cont. problem. And we're very concerned, given the
2 flaws of Yucca Mountain that are understood, about
3 the use of rate payer money and misuse of it in
4 some ways that we understand haven't even been
5 applied to the purpose that it was intended to.
6 We would recognize the desperation that's there
7 among people that work in this industry to put
8 their waste somewhere and really get it off their
9 hands. We urge the Department of Energy as it's
10 proceeding here to spend resources developing a
11 system that is safe and adequately funded and to
12 spend taxpayer and rate payer money to find an
13 appropriate site and location for this waste, and
14 please not to throw the money away.

15 We're very concerned that this is happening
16 in a form that is ultimately going to put human
17 lives at risk along the transportation route, and
18 concerned that the destination, the ultimate
19 destination that is proposed here is known to be
20 inadequate. And given that, we really raise the
21 concerns about how the rate payer money and
22 taxpayer money is being used and will be in the
23 future.

24 2 We also have some broad concerns about public
25 health impacts associated with an accident. And

1 2 cont. given the limited time here to comment, I want to
2 raise a particular issue. And we ask that the
3 Department of Energy address findings that are
4 available in a report done by Dr. Ed Lyman
5 (phonetically) of the Nuclear Control Institute
6 which, as we understand, compares releases from
7 the proposed mixed oxide fuel program in the
8 Department of Energy, compares that to releases
9 from the uranium fuel. And it does it in the
10 context of an accident, and I understand that his
11 findings related to accidents show two times more
12 latent cancers from the release of MOX, mixed
13 oxide fuel particles, than from regular irradiated
14 fuel. And we've got your Department and folks,
15 certainly, from the Aiken and Augusta area that
16 are working very hard; and some folks in that area
17 are inviting this program to be started at
18 Savannah River site. So we urge you to incorporate
19 in your assumptions what this would do in terms of
20 the public health impacts.

21 3... And we also do have special concerns that are
22 too lengthy to go into right now about the dry-
23 cask storage proposal and the way we've heard the
24 gentleman from Plant Hatch speak about their
25 problem, being that there is a dry-cask storage

1 3 cont. program that is underway there. The cask design
2 we are seeing is flawed, and we encourage you to
3 refer to the State of Utah's testimony about
4 various design flaws of the casks and what this
5 would mean both in terms of transportation as well
6 as ultimate destination.

7 Lastly, I can't go away from this microphone
8 here without saying something about what's been
9 said already tonight regarding the nuclear
10 industry. And with all due respect with those who
11 are in the room whose jobs rely on the long-term
12 survival of the nuclear industry, we've heard
13 these arguments before, many, many times before,
14 that nuclear power's safe, it's economical and
15 it's sustainable. Right here in Georgia we have
16 our own example. The development of Plant Vogtle
17 in our state was centered around the promise of
18 so-called cheap electricity, and it resulted in
19 about the worst rate hike that we've ever seen
20 here. So let's put these things that were said in
21 context. The future of the waste cost is
22 relatively uncertain, and I note --

23 MR. LAWSON: Thirty seconds, please.

24 MS. KILPATRICK: And lastly, I just want to
25 4... end by saying [we do call on nuclear industry and

1 4 cont. the DOE to incorporate into this work as well as
2 all other work a vision to truly ensure that the
3 legacy of nuclear waste is not left upon future
4 generations any more than we have already done so.
5 So [we call on the industry and the Department of
6 Energy to assist in reducing the waste that is
7 generated. Of course, the ultimate solution here
8 is to stop generating the nuclear waste in the
9 first place. And then secondary to this issue
10 here is to find an appropriate and safe site to
11 store it. And the site does not have to be
12 singular; it may be more than one.] So thank you.

13 MS. SWEENEY: Thank you.

14 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is
15 Dana Powell, to be followed by Stacy Singer and
16 Bob Fulkerson.